

# United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights

## Defender or Destroyer of Unalienable Rights?

---

United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights -- Defender of  
Destroyer of Unalienable Rights?

*By the New Jersey Committee of Safety*

As "United Nations Day" (October 24) is fast approaching there's no better time to ring the Liberty Bell. Alert the people to the threat that the UN's "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" poses to our unalienable individual rights.

In 1948 this Universal Declaration of Human Rights was issued under the signature of Eleanor Roosevelt, the chairwoman of the UN Commission on Human Rights. Though the document contains some fine sentiments ("No one shall be subject to torture") it utterly fails to protect individual rights -- if indeed that was its intended purpose. It is a socialist manifesto. The Preamble, for example, murkily declares that "the peoples of the United Nations have... determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." Such ambiguous wording ("social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom") could be interpreted -- and when the time is right, it undoubtedly will be interpreted -- as authorizing the UN General Assembly to seize and redistribute private property. Nowhere in the UDHR is there any protection for the "peoples of the United Nations" whose property would be taken to raise the "standard of life" for other "peoples of the United Nations." Article 17's "No one shall *arbitrarily* be deprived of his property" is meaningless, because the UN could *deliberately* pass a resolution to take it [emphasis added]. But this is just one illustration of why the UDHR cannot and will not protect even the most basic of individual rights.

This is not surprising, considering the UDHR's origin. Known officially as UN Resolution 217A(III) it was drafted by collectivists, and ratified by appointed officials without public discussion or debate.

There was no groundswell for a so-called UDHR. No anguished cry for it arose from the slums of India or the huts of Cameroon or the shanty towns of Brazil. Instead Resolution 217A(III) was imposed from above by elitists in Washington, Geneva and London. They took it upon themselves to assert that "freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people." The elite, hiding behind a screen of "human rights," condescended to speak for us, the "common people". Beware. Our would-be lords and masters will use the bogus "freedoms from fear and want" to destroy our unalienable rights.

In contrast to the lack of popular support for the UDHR we "common people" might consider our experience as Americans in securing our rights. Ever since the Virginia Declaration of Rights of 1776 we have insisted on bills of rights to protect us from government. In fact, without the promise of a national bill of rights the Constitution would not have been ratified. Our Bill of Rights was prepared by individuals who possessed the highest probity and intellect. It was vigorously debated by our forebears in newspapers, pamphlets and public

forums, and by our elected representatives in Congress and state houses -- unlike the UDHR.

But then the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Bill of Rights are not comparable. The fundamental difference arises from the concept of rights. The Bill of Rights recognizes natural rights, that is, that which inherently belongs to every person simply by virtue of having been born (e.g., the unfettered right to speak, assemble, defend oneself). The drafters of the UDHR on the other rejected natural rights in favor of "human rights" and (non-existent) "non-human rights." This perversion is in accordance with the views of Julian Huxley, the Director-General of the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at the time the UDHR was being drafted. (Huxley later became Sir Julian, definitely not one of the "common people".) A founder of the British Flora and Fauna Society and an advocate of euthanasia Huxley approved of plants and animals but detested humanity. ("Mankind is the greatest blight on the face of the earth," is how Ingrid Newkirk, a Huxley disciple and director of an American animal rights group, puts it.)

The UDHR of course deals only with "human rights". Huxley's "non-human rights", the "rights" of plants and animals, are advocated in other UN publications such as the 1994 book *Our Global Neighborhood*, the UN's tyrannical plan for "global governance." Unfortunately for people *Our Global Neighborhood* declares that "respect for life", a code name for plant and animal rights, has in effect supplanted "human rights." "Respect for life" is the view that mankind is just another lifeform not even necessarily on a par with plant or animal lifeforms. When necessary -- the UN and its accredited non-government organizations will decide what is necessary -- mankind must yield to the "rights" of plants and animals such as Torrey's mountain mint and the bog turtle. So much for the UDHR as protector of "human rights."

The Bill of Rights clearly prohibits government from meddling with rights. Our First amendment, for instance, forcefully limits the power of Congress: "Congress shall make no law" restricting the freedom of religion, assembly etc. UN Resolution 217A(III), (the UDHR), does just the opposite. In Orwellian language it declares that "The General Assembly [the world congress]...shall strive...by progressive measures, national and international, to secure [the] universal and effective recognition and observance [of rights and freedoms listed herein]." The UDHR thus has within the citadel a Trojan Horse, vested with unlimited power, that will destroy all rights and everyone who depends on it for protection.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights consists of thirty articles. The first twenty-one are fairly reasonable, although Art. 8 cancels out the other 21 by asserting that "fundamental rights" are "granted by the constitution or by law," the hidden premise being that the UN General Assembly can simply pass a law to cancel rights. (In contrast, our Bill of Rights acknowledges rights that pre-date the Constitution; our rights are not granted by the Constitution, nor can they be repealed by law.) Articles 22 through 28 of the UDHR are socialistic ("Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family, including food, clothing, housing...") Art. 30 is potentially dangerous to liberty, and Art. 29 is downright totalitarian: "Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined

by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare of a democratic society. These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations"

Amazingly the Universal Declaration of Human Rights protects no individual rights; in fact it contains the seeds for the destruction of rights. It is a socialist manifesto and a prescription for tyranny. Ring the Liberty Bell and spread the word -- everyone needs to take an active part in preserving our unalienable individual rights!

*The New Jersey Committee of Safety was co-founded by the Association Seeking to Preserve Individual Rights Everywhere (ASPIRE) and the New Jersey Militia. The Committee can be reached c/o 324 Atsion Rd., Shamong, NJ 08088; 609 654-8326. The Committee's website is <http://www.committee.org/njcos>.*

---

[Return to New Jersey Committee of Safety main page](#)